

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 13, 17, 20-25 and 27-35 are present in this application. By this Amendment, claims 27 and 34 have been amended. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

At the outset, Applicant extends his appreciation to Examiner Ou for his courtesy in conducting the interview with Applicant's representative on July 28, 2011. During the interview, Applicant's representative proposed amendments to claim 27 in an effort to more clearly distinguish the claims from the references of record. Examiner Ou suggested additional and alternative language for clarity and definiteness. Examiner Ou agreed that subject to further consideration, amended claim 27 appeared to be distinguishable over the Solecki et al. (WO 01/97713) in view of Amara et al. (U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0116070) combination.

Claims 13, 23, 25, 27, 28, 30, 33 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Solecki in view of Amara. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the interview, claim 27 has been amended to recite that the internal support extends linearly along the interior of at least a substantial portion of the external mesh material wall between at least two apices of the generally triangular cross-sectional shape . . . As recognized by the Examiner during the interview, Solecki lacks any corresponding structure, and Amara does not correct this shortcoming in the Solecki publication. That is, it is clear in Solecki that the purported "internal support webs (combination of 2 and 3)" do not extend linearly along an interior of at least a substantial portion of an external mesh material wall between at least two apices of a generally triangular cross-sectional shape. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that claim 27 is distinguishable over the references of record.

With regard to the dependent claims, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable independent claim.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 34. By this Amendment, claim 34 has been rewritten in independent form.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable over the art of record and that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Prompt passage to issuance is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, in the fee(s) filed, or asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to Deposit Account No. 14-1140.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:           /Alan M. Kagen/            
          Alan M. Kagen  
          Reg. No. 36,178

AMK:jls  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100